

REMARKS

1. In response to the Office Action mailed September 2, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-33 were last presented for examination. In the outstanding office action claims 1-19 and 22-33 have been rejected, and claims 20-21 have been objected to. By the foregoing Amendments, claims 1, 3, 8, 11, 14 21 and 25 have been amended, claim 12-13, 16-18, 20 and 24 have been cancelled, and claims 34-54 have been added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 1-11, 14-15, 19, 21-23 and 25-54 will remain pending in this application. Of these 47 claims, three (3) claims (claims 1, 25 and 34) are independent.

2. Based upon the above Amendment and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Art of Record

3. Applicants acknowledge receipt of form PTO-892 listing additional references identified by the Examiner.

4. Applicants also thank the Examiner for returning form PTO/SB/08 form submitted by Applicants on October 15, 2008, which has been initialed by the Examiner indicating the Examiner has considered the references cited therein.

Priority Claim

5. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 20 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include all of the elements of claim 20. Therefore, claim 1 is now claim 20 in independent form. Furthermore, independent claim 25 has also been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 20. In light of the

amendments to claims 1 and 25, Applicants respectfully request that all claims are in condition for allowance. A notice of this effect is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

7. Claims 3, 5, 19 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner has rejected these claims because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the second conversion means.” Claim 3 has been amended to recite “a second conversion means.” Therefore, Applicants assert that there is now antecedent basis for the limitation “the second conversion means,” and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3, 5, 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

8. Claims 1-7, 19 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,553,294 to Nanno *et al.*, (hereinafter, “Nanno”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

9. As noted above, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 25 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 20. Therefore, Applicants assert that claims request that 1-7, 19 and 25-27 are patentable over Nanno, and respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-7, 19 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

10. Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanno in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,541,980 to Maki. (hereinafter, “Maki”). Furthermore, claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanno in view of Maki, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,891,438 to Arai *et al.*, (hereinafter, “Arai”). Also, claims 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanno in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,635,814 to Afzal *et al.*, (hereinafter, “Afzal”). Also, claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanno in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0095020 to Kernahan *et al.*, (hereinafter, “Kernahan”). Finally, claims 31-33 stand

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanno. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

11. As discussed above, claims 1 and 25 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 20. Each of claims 8-18, 22-24 and 31-33 depends on one of amended independent claims 1 or 25. Therefore, because each of claims 8-18, 22-24 and 31-33 incorporates all the subject matter of their respective independent claims and adds additional subject matter which makes them independently patentable over the art of record, Applicants respectfully that the above rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

New Claims

12. Applicants have added new claims 34-54 to further claim embodiments of the present invention. Applicants respectfully request assert that no new matter has been added.

13. For at least the reasons discussed above with reference to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102, Applicants respectfully assert that new claims 34-54 are patentable over the art of record.

Dependent claims

14. As noted, the dependent claims incorporate all the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are also allowable over the art of record.

Conclusion

15. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.
16. Applicants reserve the right to pursue any cancelled claims or other subject matter disclosed in this application in a continuation or divisional application. Any cancellations and amendments of above claims, therefore, are not to be construed as an admission regarding the patentability of any claims and Applicants reserve the right to pursue such claims in a continuation or divisional application.

Dated: January 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael G. Verga/
Michael G. Verga
Registration No.: 43,828
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant